

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated October 13, 2005, the following rejections were made:

**Claims 1-4, and 7-9:** Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,450,028 to Vail, III.

**Claim 5:** Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obviousness in view of U.S. Patent 6,450,028 to Vail, III.

**Claims 1-4, 7-9**

Reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-4 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,450,028 to Vail, III is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been withdrawn, its limitations being incorporated into Claim 6. Claims 2 through 4 now depend from Claim 6, as currently amended, which has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of Claim 1.

Claim 7 has been amended to depend from Claim 6, as currently amended,

Claim 8 has been amended to provide "spacing different gravity sensors different distances from one another and apart to form a gravity sensor array; placing the gravity sensor array into a subsurface environment and in association with a subsurface logging apparatus". These limitations cause the method of Claim 8 to be patentably consistent with the deemed allowable subject matter of the apparatus Claim 6, as amended. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 8, as amended, is now allowable.

Independent Claims 6 and 8 are, therefore, patentably distinct from the invention disclosed in Vail, III for the reasons here provided.

Claims 6 and 8, in essence, have been amended to be in accord with the subject matter acknowledged by the Examiner to be allowable in the October 13, 2005 Office Action.

Claims 2 - 4 and 7, by virtue of their dependence on Claim 6, as currently amended, now include all of the limitations of Claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 2-4 and 7 are allowable as stated.

Claim 9, by virtue of its dependence on Claim 8, as currently amended, now includes all of the limitations of Claim 8. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 9 is allowable.

**Claim 5**

Reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,450,028 to Vail, III is respectfully requested.


Claim 5, by virtue of its dependence on Claim 1, as currently amended, now includes all of the limitations of Claim 6, as amended. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 5 is allowable as stated.

**Conclusion**

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1 through 9. Applicant thanks the Examiner for consideration of the above.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, or if further clarification is required, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. Please reference Attorney Docket No. ALAB001US1.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
William N. Hulsey III  
Reg. No. 33,402

Dated: November 23, 2005

HULSEY<sup>IP</sup> Intellectual Property Lawyers, P.C.  
1250 S. Capital of Texas Hwy.  
Bldg. 3, Suite 610  
Austin, Texas 78745  
(512) 795-0095 [Telephone]  
(512) 233-2602 [Fax]